

REMARKS

In paragraph 2 of the office action, Examiner rejects Claims 14-37 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has Canceled Claims 14-37 without prejudice and added new Claims 38-63 having substantially the same limitations as Claims 1-13. Applicant submits that new Claims 38-63 are allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 3, Examiner rejects Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for having insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended Claim 12 to depend on Claim 10, providing proper antecedent basis for "third location". Applicant has amended Claims 1, 2, 6 and 8 to correct grammatical errors. No new matter has been introduced. Applicant submits that amended Claim 12 is allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4, Examiner rejects Claims 1-11, 13-37 under USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,546,405 to Gupta et al.

Gupta is directed to a system for using a GUID unique identifier for annotating an audio or video multimedia data temporally such that the system uses the GUID to correlate the annotation with a temporal instance of the audio or video data. Thus, Gupta provides for annotating a movie frame or group of frames based on a GUID comprising an elapsed time for locating the movie frame. The GUID of Gupta is a "Globally Unique Identifier" which is very different from the Digital Fingerprint of the present invention which is not "Globally Unique". In fact, one of the major advantages of the present invention is that multiple copies of a given data file has exactly the same digital fingerprint independent of data file location. Thus, Gupta teaches away from the present invention that uses a digital fingerprint derived from data to uniquely identify the data such

that the digital fingerprint can be recreated independent of where the corresponding data resides in the system. According to the present invention, a first digital signature is generated from a record residing at location A. A second digital signature of a copy of the digital record at location B when generated would be identical to the first digital signature. A benefit of the present invention over Gupta is that a search for instances of a record based on its digital fingerprint can be contemplated that is independent of knowledge of the records location. Gupta's GUID includes information for locating a record but if the record is moved or copied, the GUID could not be used to find the moved or copied version.

Examiner says as to Claim 1, Gupta teaches "a method for annotating a data object, the method comprising the steps of:

creating a first digital fingerprint value of the data object" (Col 12, lines 58-66 (GUID) a Globally Unique Identifier is assigned to multimedia document, where GUID is a concatenation of an IP address, a time stamp and a random number), the data object stored at a first location; (Col 12, lines 35-41, Fig 1A). Applicant disagrees. Paragraph {0004} of the present invention describes well known digital fingerprints as "Digital fingerprints are described in "Digital Signatures: How They Work" in April 9, 1996 PC Magazine. A digital fingerprint is a computable identifier for a given set of bytes." Thus, the digital fingerprint in the art and of the present invention is a value computed from data such that the value can be calculated independent of where the data is stored. The GUID of Gupta is not a digital fingerprint of the data object since it is not computed from the data of the data object. Gupta is silent on "Digital Fingerprinting" or "creating a first digital fingerprint value of the data object" as shown in the claim.

Examiner says Gupta teaches "creating a first annotation object; creating a first relationship relating the first digital

fingerprint value to the first location; creating a second relationship relating the first digital fingerprint value to the first annotation object; and saving in an annotation store any one of the first relationship or the second relationship." Applicant disagrees. As shown above, Gupta contemplates a GUID which is a globally unique and does not contemplate any "digital fingerprint," "creating a second relationship relating the first digital fingerprint value to the first annotation object;" or "saving in an annotation store any one of the first relationship or the second relationship" as shown in the claim. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to more clearly show the digital fingerprint of a data object consisting of digital data is created from the digital data of the object. Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

As new Claims 38 and 51 comprise substantially the same limitations as allowable Claim 1, Claims 38 and 51 are allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

As claims 2-13, 39-50 and 52-63 depend on allowable Claims 1, 38 and 51 respectively, applicant submits that Claims 2-13, 39-50 and 52-63 are allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

As the present application is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/John E Campbell/ #52, 687

BY: _____

JOHN E. CAMPBELL-AGENT
Registration No. 52, 687
Phone: 845-433-1156
Fax: 845-432-9786